

Mr. DEUTSCH. And then to the opposition, and then it will revert back and forth?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I have been attempting to personalize this issue as much as I can. One of the things I would ask my colleagues to do is look at some of the lists of groups that are supporting the Greenwood-Deutsch amendment in opposition to the Weldon bill: the Parkinson's Action Network, the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Alliance for Aging, American Infertility Association, American Liver Foundation, International Kidney Cancer Foundation.

I mention several of these organizations because as I have said, and I think what we all acknowledge, that the issue of using embryonic stem cell research is over. And why is it over? Because of the 435 Members in this Chamber, we have heard from our friends, from our families, from our neighbors, from our constituents about real people who are suffering real diseases. That suffering is incalculable. None of us would want that to happen to anyone. Yet we know it exists and we feel pain when we talk to people. Many of us experience that pain ourselves. I put up these numbers again to note that the individuals added collectively together add up to tens of millions of Americans and to hundreds of millions of family Members.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have had a good 2 hours of debate, and it has been encouraging to see the extent to which Members of Congress have been able to grapple with this very complicated issue.

Unfortunately, the Members who are speaking are the ones who have mastered it. We will have a vote within the hour and unfortunately most Members will come here pretty confused about the issue.

Let me try to simplify the issue once again and ask that we try to avoid some of the ad hominem argument that I think is beginning, and the hostility, frankly, that is beginning to develop on the floor on this issue. This is not a question about who has values and who stands for human life and who does not. It is a very legitimate and important and historic debate about how it is that we are able to use the DNA that God put into our own bodies, use the brain that God gave us to think creatively, and to employ this research to save the lives of men, women and children in this country and throughout the world and to rescue them from terribly debilitating and life-shortening diseases.

□ 1615

We have an extraordinary opportunity to do this with the research technique that does not involve con-

ception. It is an interesting question to look at, when is it that people over history have defined the onset of life.

The Catholic Church used to say that it began with quickening, when a woman could feel the motion of the fetus in her womb, and that was when ensoulment occurred. When scientists discovered how fertilization worked, the Church changed its opinion and said life actually begins at conception, at fertilization, and for those who adhere to that position, they have my utmost respect. I do not think they ought to put their position into the statutes of the Federal Government, but they certainly should be respected for that belief that they have.

But now we have moved the goalposts again, and now somehow we are supposed to be required to, A, believe that ensoulment occurs when a somatic cell taken from someone's skin divides in a petri dish, and for those who want to make that leap of faith, or leap of whatever it is, belief, they are welcome to do that.

But to put into the statutes of the Federal Government a prohibition against using the state of the art research that is wonderfully brilliant, fine and inspired, and noble researchers are trying to employ in the laboratory for the very purpose of saving the lives of people, to put into law a Federal ban against that, I think, is immoral. I think it is wrong, and we should not do it.

Now, the Greenwood-Deutsch substitute is very simple. All we have been trying to do from the very beginning is prohibit reproductive cloning. That is all we do. That is all we do, is say thou shalt not create new babies using cloning, because it is not safe and it is not ethical.

I said months ago to the leadership of this House, if you want to do what we all agree on, we all want to stop that, then we need to shoot a silver bullet and a rifle shot and stop that legislatively. We could do that.

I said then but if we get mired down into the stem cell debate, the result is predictable. The legislation will go nowhere, this bill when it passes the House today will not be taken up in the Senate. I cannot believe the Senate is going to get into this issue.

So what will we have done at the end of the day? We will have done nothing. We will not have banned reproductive cloning, because it is more interesting to get into this extraordinary metaphysical debate whether life does or does not begin when a skin cell divides in a petri dish.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the substitute that has been offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD). This substitute is a big mistake for a number of reasons, and it should not be supported. Most notably, it would make

the prohibition against human cloning virtually impossible to enforce, it would foster the creation of cloned human embryos through the Department of Health and Human Services, and trump States that wish to prohibit cloning.

As I have already stated, allowing the creation of cloned embryos by law would enable anyone to attempt to clone a human being. While most individuals do not have the scientific capacity to clone human embryos, once they have been cloned, there is no mechanism for tracking them.

In fact, one would logically expect an organization authorized to clone human embryos pursuant to this substitute to be prepared to produce an abundance of cloned embryos for research. Meanwhile, those without the capabilities to clone embryos, could easily implant any of the legally cloned embryos, if they had the opportunity, and a child would develop.

Furthermore, those who do want to clone humans for reproductive purposes are very well funded and may have the capability to clone embryos. Would they be banned from registering with HHS under this amendment, or would they be authorized to create cloned embryos under the watchful eye of the Federal Government? If not, what would prevent any of these privately funded groups from creating a new organization with unknown intentions? If they did attempt human cloning for reproductive purposes, who would be held accountable? The lead scientists or others, or would the impregnated mother?

The fact is, any legislative effort to prohibit cloning must allow enforcement to occur before a cloned embryo is implanted. Otherwise, it is too late, and that is the big deficiency in the Greenwood substitute.

The substitute attempts to draw a distinction between necessary scientific research and human cloning by authorizing HHS to administer a quasi-registry; quasi because the embryos are not in the custody of HHS, they are maintained by private individuals. However, let us be clear, the crux of this substitute is to invoke a debate on stem cell research, a political knuckle ball, and this debate on stem cell research is a red herring.

First, therapeutic cloning does not exist, not even for experimental tests on animals.

Second, the substitute would require authorized researchers to destroy unused embryos, the first Federal mandate of its kind and a step that is extremely controversial.

Third, the bill allows for the production of cloned embryos for stem cell research. Again, H.R. 2505 does not prohibit stem cell research. It does not prohibit stem cell research. Currently private organizations are able to conduct unfettered research on embryonic stem cells. While this research is ethically and morally controversial, it has been heralded, because embryonic stem